

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 remain in this application. Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-11 are amended herein to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyake (US 5,522,667). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections.

For a rejection to be sustained under §102(b) each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the cited prior art reference. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to disclose at least the following features and elements of the present invention as noted herein.

The claims as currently pending each includes a recitation deliberately setting a relationship between a guide clearance  $\alpha$  and a pocket clearance  $\beta$  at  $\alpha \leq \beta$ , wherein the guide clearance of said annular cage with respect to said inner ring is  $\alpha$  and the pocket clearance of a pocket inner wall face with respect to said ball is  $\beta$ . As set forth in the specification, such relationship decreases the interference of the annular cage on the ball to a minimum, even when the cage rotates eccentrically. No such structural requirement or guideline is taught or suggested in Miyake.

Miyake is primarily directed to the provision of a retainer for retaining a plurality of balls in pockets formed therein which is made of heat resistant synthetic resin. While the disclosure qualifies that a gap t14 between the retainer and an inner surface of the outer ring must be within a prescribed percentage range of the outer diameter of the retainer, and also discloses a relationship between both the gap dimension t14 and another gap dimension t15 and an outer diameter of the balls (see col. 6, lines 49-62), Miyake is silent regarding any relationship between the gap dimension t14 and the other gap dimension t15 ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , respectively). Therefore, Miyake fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature in accordance with which the guide clearance is deliberately set to be equal to or less than the pocket clearance, as claimed. Thus the reference fails to anticipate the claims.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Miyake reference. Claims 5-8, 10 and 12 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Miyake reference. Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections.

It is respectfully submitted that the Miyake reference cannot render the rejected claims obvious because the reference does not provide the teaching noted above with respect to feature discussed above relative to the anticipation rejection.

Thus, the reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 3, 5-8 and 10-12 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

It is further noted that the above discussed feature was present in the originally filed claims. As such, the present amendments cannot necessitate new grounds for rejection as the present rejections are respectfully submitted as failing to have been established. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that a next Office Action cannot be made final.

Applicant respectfully requests a two (2) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$420 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg by:  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

Janey & Noel  
Reg No. 36,049